DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 499 TE 001 499

By-Neville, Margaret M.; Papillon, Alfred L.

Advanced Composition in the Preparation of Prospective Secondary School English Teachers. Interim Report.

Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary English Teachers (ISCPET), Urbana.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-5-0789
Pub Date May 69
Contract-OEC-5-10-029
Note-31p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.65
Descriptors-*Composition (Literary), Educational Improvement, *English Education, English Instruction, Measurement Instruments, *Preservice Education, Secondary Education, *Secondary School Teachers, Teacher Education, *Teacher Education Curriculum, Teacher Qualifications
Identifiers-Project English

A study to learn if a special course on teaching composition to high school students would affect the classroom competence of prospective English teachers was conducted. An experimental group of 36 future English teachers at DePaul University was compared with a control group of 36 similar students at Loyola University, a school with a parallel English Education program. The independent variable was the special composition course taught at DePaul. The two test instruments developed to measure the effect of the special course were the "Examination in English Composition for Secondary School English Teachers" and the "Scale for Rating Teaching of English Composition." Although the tests revealed no statistically significant performance differences between the two groups, the expeimental group, which was below the control group in English grade point total, did as well as its counterpart. The equal test scores apparently resulted from the small sample involved and the complexities of administrative arrangements for the experiment. Since the experimental group improved more than the control group, the inference is that a special course on teaching English composition in the high school classroom would be beneficial for the prospective English teacher. (Author/MP)

ED031499

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INTERIM REPORT

USOE Project Number HE-145

USOE Contract Number OE-5-10-029

ISCPET Subcontract Number SS-3-2-65

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS (ISCPET)

Advanced Composition in the Preparation of Prospective Secondary School English Teachers

Margaret M. Neville
Alfred L. Papillon
DePaul University
Chicago, Illinois

May, 1969

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to a subcontract with the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois. Contractors and subcontractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the projects. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

TE001499

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS (ISCPET)

Director: J. N. Hook
Associate Director: Paul H. Jacobs
Research Associate: Raymond D. Crisp

Project Headquarters:
1210 West California
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Raymond D. Crisp, University of Illinois, non-voting member
William H. Evans, Southern Illinois University, past member
John S. Gerrietts, Loyola University, past member and Chairman
John M. Heissler, Illinois State University, past Chairman
J. N. Hook, University of Illinois
Paul H. Jacobs, University of Illinois
Alfred L. Papillon, DePaul University, Chairman
Justus R. Pearson, Illinois Wesleyan University, past member and Chairman
Roy K. Weshinskey, Southern Illinois University, past Chairman

COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS AND PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVES

Aurora College - Roy L. Crews and Ethel W. Tapper
Bradley University - W. F. Elwood and Paul Sawyer
DePaul University - Margaret M. Neville and Alfred L. Papillon
Greenville College - I. D. Baker and Donald Pennington
Illinois Institute of Technology - A. L. Davis and Henry C. Knepler
Illinois State University - Victor E. Gimmestad and John M. Heissler
Illinois Wesleyan University - Justus R. Pearson and Clifford Pfeltz
Knox College - Michael G. Crowell and Carl Eisemann
Loyola University - James Barry and Sister Mary Constantine
Monmouth College - Grace Boswell and Ben T. Shawver
North Central College - Richard M. Eastman and Erling Peterson
Northwestern University - Sidney Bergquist and Wallace Douglas
Olivet Nazarene College - Fordyce Bennett and Vernon T. Groves
Rockford College - William D. Baker and Ronald Podeschi
Roosevelt University - William Leppert and William Makely
Saint Xavier College - Thomas Deegan and George K. McGuire
Southern Illinois University - Ellen A. Frogner and Roy K. Weshinskey
University of Chicago - Janet A. Emig and Robert Parker
University of Illinois - J. N. Hook and Paul H. Jacobs
Western Illinois University - Alfred Lindsey, Jr. and Sherman Rush

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Harry S. Broudy, University of Illinois
Dwight L. Burton, Florida State University
Robert Bush, Stanford University
Nelson W. Francis, Brown University
Nathaniel Gage, Stanford University
Alfred H. Grommon, Stanford University
William Riley Parker, Indiana University (Deceased)
Robert C. Pooley, Department of Public Instruction, Wisconsin
Loren Reid, University of Missouri
William Sheldon, Syracuse University
James R. Squire, formerly of the University of Illinois; past Executive Secretary, National Council of Teachers of English

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. SUMMARY 1

II. INTRODUCTION: THE TOPIC 2

Survey of Related Literature. 2

The Independent Variable 3

The Dependent Variable 4

The Mediating Variable 4

III. THE SPECIAL COMPOSITION COURSE 5

Content 5

Syllabus 5

Faculty 7

Development and Modification of the Course 7

IV. COLLECTION OF DATA 9

The Purpose 9

The Hypothesis 10

The Sample. 10

The Measuring Instrument. 11

V. INTERPRETATION OF CRITERION DATA 13

Criterion and Covariate Data. 13

Analysis of Covariance. 13

Findings. 14

Discussion. 14

VI. References. 16

APPENDIXES

A. Examination in English Composition for Secondary School English Teachers. 18

B. Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition (Section of Preliminary Statement of Qualifications of Secondary School Teachers of English) 27

C. Scores of the Experimental and the Control Groups on the Criterion and the Control Variables. 28

I. SUMMARY

The English Department at DePaul University selected for their project in Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers (ISCPET) an experiment in which a Special Composition Course would be taught to future secondary school English teachers and its results in improving their competence would be measured.

The better to place this experiment in perspective, the literature on the preparation of future English composition teachers was surveyed. In this study, the survey of literature served not only to justify the topic, it also provided guidelines for establishing the research design. Broadly stated, the study included teaching the Special Composition Course to at least thirty future English teachers at DePaul University as an experimental group, and to measure and analyze their preparedness to teach English Composition as compared to that of a control group of at least thirty future English teachers at Loyola University. The English curriculum of Loyola closely parallels that of DePaul, except that DePaul included the additional Special Composition Course.

The purpose of the study was, therefore, to measure the effect of the Special Composition Course upon the competence of the beginning English composition teachers. Preparedness was to be measured in terms of an examination in English Composition which would be designed for that purpose. The hypothesis of the experiment was that the preparedness to teach composition of the future teachers who took the course would be greater than the preparedness of the future teachers who did not take the course, given the equivalence of the two groups, and measuring preparedness in terms of the specially designed examination. Expressed as a null hypothesis for the purposes of statistical analysis, the hypothesis was that there would be no significant difference in the preparedness of the two groups, when preparedness was measured in terms of the examination.

The Special Composition Course was designed by the English Department at DePaul University. The content of the course was selected for its value to the prospective secondary school English teacher, and the methodological approach was to emphasize evaluating samples of writing and how to teach English Composition.

The measuring instrument, the Examination in English Composition for English Teachers, was developed cooperatively by the English Department and the School of Education at DePaul. It was oriented toward the content and the methodology of the Special Composition Course.

During the years 1967-1968 and 1968-1969, the examination was administered to some students each term until there were 36 in each group.

Analysis of Covariance was used to analyze test scores. There was no statistical difference between the two groups, but the experimental group, which was below the control group in English Grade Point Total, did as well as its counterpart. The inference is that the Special Composition Course accounted for this "catching up."

The modest positive results argue that with larger groups and better administrative arrangements, a course of this type would produce significant results. It is recommended that the course be further refined and that the examination be more thoroughly validated.

II. INTRODUCTION: THE TOPIC

This initial section of the DePaul Special Study report reviews the literature on the topic and analyzes the topic for the independent, the dependent, and the mediating variables involved in it.

Survey of Related Literature

References to the inadequacies in the preparation of secondary school teachers of English are frequent in the literature on the topic. Since the project herein reported is concerned with preparing secondary school English teachers to teach composition, a brief report on some of the substantive problems in this area provides the setting within which this research was done.

The Committee on the National Interest discovered in a survey of colleges which prepare English teachers that only one-fourth of the colleges require a course in history of the English language, only 17.4 percent require a course in Modern English Grammar, and only 41 percent require a course in advanced composition (13, p. 60). As a result of its study, the Committee recommended as a standard of preparation that teachers of English should have a fundamental knowledge of the historical development and present character of the English language, a specialized knowledge of the same appropriate to the teacher's particular field and responsibility, and an informed command of rhetoric and logic. J. N. Hook has outlined sixteen problem areas in the preparation of English teachers for which solutions need to be sought through research (15). He also coordinated the meetings of the Institutional Representatives in the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers in which they formulated a statement of the qualifications which English teachers should possess (6). Included in this statement is a section on Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition (6, p. 167), which is the fundamental conceptualization on which the research design of this study of the effectiveness of a Special Composition Course to increase the competence of beginning teachers is based. In addition to concern for the scope of the preparation of secondary school English teachers in composition, another author points out that the problem of the sequence of learning in the teaching of English is yet unsolved (7, pp. 85-91).

The impact of linguistics on the study and teaching of grammar is one of the major current trends in teaching English. There is a need to change from concern for "What is right language?" to concern for "What is language?" and to recognize the importance of responsible use of language in everyday life (4, pp. 9-18). A research source on teaching English points out that the development of language skills requires long periods of carefully planned sequential instruction, and that new insights into the nature and structure of the language have caused many of the studies on the teaching of composition to lose the significance attributed to them in the past, especially studies relating to grammar and usage (8, pp. 966-7). The present study took this viewpoint into consideration generally in developing the Special Composition Course, but sequence in learning was not singled out as a research purpose.

In the area of objectives of teaching composition, the teaching of composition has been viewed primarily from the situations which require written language either in school or in adult life (11 and 12). The Educational Testing Service has followed this point of view in developing instruments of evaluation (3). The

approach of language written for everyday life was adopted as a guideline in the present investigation, both for the writing requirements in the course and for the Examination in English Composition which was developed to measure the outcomes of the Special Composition Course.

The relationship of composition skill to other variables has been the object of research. It has been reported that the vocabulary sections of intelligence tests have superior value in predicting composition skill, and that the verbal score on a scholastic aptitude test is more highly correlated with teachers' ratings of pupils' composition skills than any other measure (1). On the interrelationships among language skills, a state survey has reported the importance of using reading and writing as supplements to each other in teaching English (9). Reviews of educational research also point out that grammar and usage should not be taught in isolation from written composition (16, pp. 454-70). These directives were all implemented in the present study in the planning and the teaching of the Special Composition Course.

Some investigations have been concerned with marking and evaluating student writing. One study reported that for a group of 150 students, a total of 28.5 hours a week would be required on an average to read papers adequately and supervise corrections (9). Also, it has been reported that the expository essay on a contemporary issue is most effective in developing thought processes, evaluative skills, and skills of organization (2). The expository essay was used as a focal point in teaching the Special Composition Course, and it is the principal component of the Examination in English Composition for English Teachers, which was developed to measure the outcomes of the course in this study.

The related research findings summarized in the preceding pages provided the conceptual framework for DePaul University's Special Study in ISCPET. It is obvious that the findings of this previous research establish the significance of striving to improve competence in the teaching of English composition. In addition to justifying the topic, those research findings were also used for developing the experimental variable, the Special Composition Course, setting the purpose, underlining the hypothesis, and guiding the construction of the measuring instrument. Thus, the design of this Special Study was built upon previous research findings.

The Independent Variable

The independent variable in this study was a composition course, which was thought to be a factor that could increase the competence of beginning teachers of English. The crux of the experiment was to determine whether students who took this course in their program of preparation would be better prepared to teach composition than students who did not take the course in their program of preparation.

In order that the Special Composition Course might serve as the experimental variable in the study, it was given some experimental traits. Chief among these traits is that it was an additional offering in English Composition. The students in the experimental group took this course in addition to two regular freshman-level composition courses whereas the students in the control group took only two regular freshman composition courses. The second experimental characteristic of the special course was that content was selected with a view toward its value for the classroom teacher, especially the beginning teacher. The third experimental

characteristic of the course was the teaching strategy which was employed. Basically, this strategy was to teach the students how to teach composition, and it was implemented through extensive analysis and evaluation of samples of writing done by high school students. Thus, in itself and in its design, the Special Composition Course was planned as an independent variable which might conceivably improve the teaching competence of beginning teachers in English composition. Because of the vital importance of the independent variable in an experiment, a more detailed description is given of the course in the succeeding main section of this report.

The Dependent Variable

The dependent variable is the outcome or change in outcomes expected to result from the impact of the independent variable. In this study, the dependent variable is competence in teaching English Composition. It was decided that the scores of students on an examination in composition would serve as the criterion for determining the influence of the course on competence in teaching composition. By statistical analysis it was sought to determine whether the students in the experimental group scored significantly higher than their peers in the control group as a result of having studied the Special Composition Course.

The Mediating Variable

It may sometimes occur that the influence of an independent variable on a dependent variable is interfered with by some intervening variable, referred to here as a mediating variable. In this Special Study, if one of the groups were superior to the other in aptitude for the study of English, differences in the scores on the English Composition Examination might be attributable to this initial underlying difference between the groups rather than to the fact that one group had taken the Special Composition Course and the other group had not. To eliminate the possibility of distortion of the examination scores by the mediating variable of aptitude for English study, the grade point total of the students on their first five English courses was used as a measure of their aptitude to study English, and this grade point total was used as the control variable in the analysis of covariance of the examination scores in the statistical interpretation of the data.

III. THE SPECIAL COMPOSITION COURSE

The course English 301--Advanced Theory and Practice of Composition for Secondary School Teachers--was the experimental (independent) variable in the DePaul Special Study.

Content

The basic conviction behind this course was that the teacher must know not merely the art of composition, but the linguistic, logical and psychological facts which give the rationale for it. With this conviction in mind the course was planned to begin with a study of the word as the unit of expression of a mental concept, and to proceed to the sentence as the unit of judgment of relationship between mental concepts. Grammar was not studied for its own sake, but only as an aid to the better understanding of the art of written communication. Emphasis was placed on such fundamentals as subject-predicate relationship and the usefulness of a thorough understanding of grammatical modification. The so-called "rules" of grammar were not part of the course.

Initial Syllabus English 301

To make this course especially useful to prospective teachers of secondary school English composition, each of the content sections of the course was accompanied by a three part exercise: (1) study of some reading material pertinent to the section, (2) writing of a composition, (3) examination of other students' compositions, (4) study of a linguistic approach to grammar and composition in H. A. Gleason, Linguistics and English Grammar (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965). The content of the course was the following:

I. The Elements of Communication.
   a. The mental image and the term used to express it. Nouns, verbs, modifiers.
   b. The predication.
   c. Conjunctive forms. Complex and compound structures.

II. The Grammar of the English Language.
   a. Logical elements and conventional elements in grammar.
   b. Germanic nature of the English language, and consequent features of English grammar.
   c. The elements of social acceptability in grammatical forms.
   d. Dialect variations in grammatical forms.

III. Grammar and Rhetoric in the Sentence. The grammatically correct and the rhetorically effective sentence compared.

IV. The Paragraph. Methods of paragraph development; the relationship of the paragraph to the longer composition.

V. Semantics. Choice of words for logical and psychological effectiveness.

VI. The Long Composition. Need for plan and purpose. Ordering of matter to plan and purpose. Logic and psychology involved in various types of composition.

VII. The Expository Paper.

VIII. The Narrative and Descriptive Paper.

IX. The Argumentative Paper.

X. The Creative Element in Composition. Creative use of words and of sentence and paragraph structure.

Note: It may be seen that most of the items listed above had been taught in the Freshman course in English. The emphasis in the present course, however, was on a thorough understanding of the principles which a prospective teacher should have in mind in his presentation of composition techniques. To this end a great part of the class time was devoted to analysis of the various techniques in use. To correlate new ideas of grammar with composition, the subject matter chosen for some of the papers to be written was a discussion of material in Gleason's text. The supplementary reading for this course was made up almost entirely of selections from professional journals in the teaching of English, such as College English, College Composition and Communication, the English Journal, and Elementary English. The last named was recommended to give the prospective secondary school teacher some insight into the problems which his predecessors in the grades have faced. Current issues of popular periodicals and newspapers were used for analysis of contemporary writing.

Assignments for the sections of the course were:

I. a. Study of the sentence in pieces of professional writing to note effective modification of mental images, and to note effective use of complex and compound structures.
b. Writing of a short composition (300 words) to practice matter studied.
c. Examination of other students' papers.
d. Gleason, Chapters 1-4.

II. a. Readings in College English, College Composition and Communication, English Journal on grammar and linguistics.
b. Report on readings. Essays of reactions to ideas read.
c. Examination of other students' papers.
d. Gleason, Chapters 5-9.

III. a. Analysis of sentences in assigned readings (periodicals, newspapers) to note relationship between grammatical and rhetorical elements.
b. Writing and rewriting of sentences in different patterns for increased effectiveness. (Earlier papers might be used for revision.)
c. Examination of other students' papers.
d. Gleason, Chapters 10-12.

IV. a. Study of paragraphs in the reader and in periodicals. (The Reader used was Templeman's On Writing Well, Odyssey Press, 1964.)
b. Writing of five or six types of paragraphs.
c. Examination of other students' papers. Examination of some papers written by high school students.
d. Gleason, Chapters 13-17.

V. a. Study of matter in the reader, in assigned periodical articles and in newspaper editorials for semantic values.
b. Writing of short paper, possibly editorial to illustrate careful choice of words for semantic value.
c. Examination of other students' papers. Examination of some papers written by high school students.
d. Gleason, Chapters 18-19.

VI. a. Study of long articles in periodicals to determine the author's plan and purpose, and to note appropriateness of composition techniques to the plan and purpose.
b. Writing analysis of one of the articles in a. (These articles might by from the professional journals.)
c. Examination of other students' papers to determine whether plan and purpose are made evident. Examination of high school students' papers to see their achievements in this phase of composition.

VII. a. Study of periodical and reader material illustrative of each of
VIII. these types of composition.
and IX. b. Writing of a composition of each of these types.
c. Examination of other students' papers to note excellencies and defects in the writing of these three forms of composition.

X. a. Readings in the reader on the subject of creative writing. Study of selected pieces of creative writing.
b. Writing of a piece of imaginative prose or poetry.
c. Examination of other students' papers, and of some high school students' papers.

Faculty

The three faculty members involved in this experimental course were experienced composition teachers, two of them each having had ten or more years of grade and high school teaching experience before entering college teaching. These two were chosen because of their ability to relate this college course to the special needs of prospective secondary school teachers. The third member of the team was the originator of the special course, especially interested in composition teaching techniques.

Development and Modification of the Course

In the five years of experimenting with the special composition course (English 301), and partly because of its presence in the English department, need for developing a separate linguistics and grammar course became evident. Thus a course entitled "Linguistics and the Grammar of Modern English" was introduced. The language and grammar emphasis in the first part of English 301 was reduced, and so room was opened for the development of other parts.

From the beginning there was provision for the students to gain experience in the correcting of composition papers--their own, their classmates', and some high school students' papers. This part of the course proved most important in the training of the prospective teachers, and so was consistently emphasized. Thorough analysis of students' papers by members of the class is standard procedure now. Explication of composition techniques in students' papers and in pieces

of professional writing is presented to the class by individual students as a means of introducing them to actual composition teaching.

Readings assigned in the course have become more varied than they were in the original syllabus, but the emphasis is on matter that will be professionally useful to the future composition teacher.

IV. COLLECTION OF DATA

This section of the DePaul Special Study report is concerned with the purpose, the hypothesis, the sample, and the measuring instrument in its research design.

The Purpose

The researchers in the DePaul Special Study had the option of several purposes to select from in their experiment to increase the competence of beginning English teachers. In greater evidence among these optional purposes were: 1) to increase the competence of prospective teachers in terms of personal mastery or conceptual knowledge of English composition, 2) to increase the competence of beginning teachers of English composition in terms of personal skill in writing in the English language, 3) to increase the competence of beginning teachers of English composition in terms of guiding the efforts of students to improve their writing in the English language, 4) to increase the competence of beginning teachers of English composition in terms of developing in students conceptual knowledge and principles for writing in the English language, and 5) to increase the competence of beginning teachers of English composition in terms of ability to evaluate samples of writing in the English language. In view of this listing and of the listing of other possible purposes, it was evident that for the exigencies of a Special Study in ISCPET, a choice would have to be made among the optional purposes. Moreover, it is the function of purposing in research design to limit the topic by setting specific purposes.

The better to make the selection among optional purposes, the researchers resorted to two criteria to determine which purposes would be acceptable and which would be unacceptable. The two criteria were: 1) closeness to the general purposes of ISCPET, and 2) closeness to the Statement of Qualifications of beginning teachers formulated in the early phases of ISCPET. In the light of these two criteria, the first two purposes listed above were too distant and hence they were rejected, but the remaining three purposes were close to ISCPET purposes, and hence they were adopted. Guiding the efforts of students to improve their writing in English, developing in students conceptual knowledge and principles for writing in English, and evaluating samples of writing in English are in effect closely knit sub-purposes which can all be summarized under the rubric "preparedness" to teach English composition. The statement of purpose of the DePaul Special Study may therefore be formulated as the following question: "Will beginning English teachers whose program of preparation included the Special Composition Course be better prepared to teach English composition than beginning English teachers whose program of preparation did not include the Special Composition Course, when preparedness is measured in terms of scores on the Examination in English Composition for Secondary School English Teachers (14)?"

With this formulation of purpose, the topic of the DePaul Special Study was limited, and the direction was set for the remaining elements of its research design. The hypothesis, the choice of criterion data, and the description of the instrument for securing the criterion data were all controlled by the purpose. In fact, the criterion data and the instrument for collecting the data were involved in the formal statement of purpose in the question above.

The Hypothesis

The hypothesis is the affirmative counterpart of the purpose, which is interrogative. Accordingly, the affirmative form of the question above setting forth the purpose of the DePaul Special Study is the following: "Beginning English teachers whose program of preparation included the Special Composition Course will be better prepared to teach English composition than beginning teachers whose program of preparation did not include the Special Composition Course, when preparation is measured in terms of scores on the Examination in English Composition for Secondary School English Teachers." This is the so-called "research" or non-technical statement of the hypothesis. With a view toward testing the hypothesis through statistical analysis, the hypothesis had to be re-cast as a statement of null hypothesis. As a statement of null hypothesis, it reads: "There will be no significant difference between the scores in preparedness to teach English composition of beginning English teachers whose program of preparation included the Special Composition Course and beginning English teachers whose program of preparation did not include the Special Composition Course, when preparedness is measured in terms of scores on the Examination in English Composition for Secondary School English Teachers."

The research design of an investigation should present a formal statement of its hypothesis, which has been done in the preceding paragraphs, and it should also put forward the thinking which underlies the hypothesis. To this end, three reasons can be given to justify the hypothesis of this study. The first argument is that, on the admission of those who prepare English teachers, and of English teachers themselves, preparation in composition is inadequate. The second argument is that there is lack of orientation to teaching high school composition in the college composition courses of future teachers. The third argument is that new developments in linguistics and grammar are unfamiliar to many English teachers, and the relationship of these developments to high school composition are as yet unclarified. These arguments are arrived at not only by observation and intuition: they are reflected empirically in the research on the topic. They make the hypothesis a reasoned viewpoint and justify it.

The Sample

The sample was intended to be made up of seniors who were preparing to be English teachers. The numbers of students enrolled in this program, however, did not furnish a sufficient number of individuals from the viewpoint of statistical procedures; therefore, some juniors in preparation to be English teachers had to be included in the sample. Evidence of students below the senior level in the sample is found in the fact that originally, the grade point total for ten courses in English was to be the covariate in the analysis of covariance, but this criterion had to be reduced to grade point total for five courses in English because a few individuals did not have more than that number of English courses. In general, the sample may best be described as students who were in the late phases of preparation to be English teachers. The total number of individuals in the sample was 72, with 36 in the experimental group and 36 in the control group. The sample was inter-institutionally constituted, the experimental group coming from DePaul University, and the control group coming from Loyola University. This administrative arrangement was necessitated because DePaul did not have enough students preparing to be secondary school English teachers to provide both the experimental and the control groups. The inter-institutionality of the sample was facilitated by the fact that Loyola includes only two freshman courses in composition in its curriculum to prepare high school English teachers, but otherwise its curriculum very closely

parallels the DePaul curriculum for future English teachers. Not only were the experimental group and the control group from different institutions, they were also both cumulated at their home institution over the years 1967-1968 and 1968-1969. Each semester or term, some students were added to each group because in no one term did either institution enroll the minimum of 30 for each group which had been predetermined as a prerequisite for statistical procedures.

The sample in the DePaul Special Study is not representative of any population beyond the 72 individuals involved in it. The reason for this is that the individuals in the experimental group and in the control group were not selected by any random or other sampling design, but simply because they happened to be available. Hence, the sample and the universe are co-terminous, and no generalizability of the findings is possible beyond the 72 students in the study. This restriction on the research design of the study was accepted on the grounds that the "crucial" experiment, testing a hypothesis once and for all times, is no longer held feasible, and generalizability of findings is achieved better through numerous replications of the experiment in a variety of settings. Furthermore, there could be no assumption of equivalence of the two groups, since individuals were not assigned at random to the experimental or the control group, and since the individuals in each group were not matched. Lack of equivalence of the groups in the sample, however, did not constitute an insurmountable obstacle. On the contrary, the simple solution to this problem was to use the analysis of covariance for the statistical treatment of the criterion data. This statistical procedure would make a correction of the criterion scores (examination scores) in terms of the covariate scores (grade point totals for five English courses), and thus open the way for the use of residual sums of squares in computing the F-ratio. The rationale for using grade point total in English courses as the covariate was that grade point is related to aptitude to study English, and that this aptitude is a sound norm by which to control the equivalence of the experimental and the control groups.

Instrument for Criterion Measurement

The researchers in the DePaul Special Study were convinced that no available measuring instruments existed that would yield valid measurements of its criterion data. Otherwise stated, no tests or scales were available which would yield the measurements which were called for by the purposes of the study. The tests in English composition which are available yield measurements of personal mastery of conceptual knowledge of English composition and/or of mastery of personal writing skills. Unfortunately, such scores would be valid measurements for precisely the two purposes which had been ruled out for the DePaul Special Study. To satisfy the purposes which had been accepted in the study, what was needed was an instrument to measure preparedness to teach English composition, or, more generally, effectiveness in teaching English composition.

It therefore became necessary to construct an instrument to secure the criterion measurements. The basic design decided upon for this instrument was one which would present samples of writing by high school students and to construct objective, multiple-choice items which would test the examinee's ability to evaluate the samples of writing or to make suggestions for improving them.

To assure that the projected examination would test content of proven value, the literature in tests and measurements for English composition was researched, and the expertise of the DePaul Institutional Representatives and the Members of

the Ad Hoc Committee from the English Department was relied on. From the literature in the field, the Journal of Educational Measurement proved especially helpful (10). A resource list of topics for test items and options within the items was drawn up, and at this point the task of constructing a draft of the examination reverted to Institutional Representatives and Ad Hoc Committee Members from the School of Education. After this division of labor, it became the joint task of all the people involved in the DePaul Special Study to revise and refine the examination in the light of the best informed local scholarly ability. In addition to the DePaul personnel involved, Professor J. N. Hook, ISCPET Director, was consulted periodicallly in the construction of the examination, especially when he came to DePaul for the annual ISCPET visitations.

The instrument which resulted from these endeavors is entitled Examination in English Composition for Secondary School English Teachers. The examination is in two parts, Part I dealing with the comparative evaluation of three short English compositions by high school students, and Part II dealing with evaluation in somewhat greater depth of one comparatively longer English composition by a high school student. The ten items in Part I require the examinee to evaluate the three short compositions in comparison to each other in terms of one rather comprehensive criterion of good composition in each item. The twenty items in Part II require the examinee to evaluate the single composition or some part of it, or to make suggestions to improve it in terms of one specific criterion of good composition in each item. The examination has a total score of 30 points, and may be administered in a time period of 50 minutes. A copy of the examination is found in Appendix A of this report.

In addition to constructing the Examination in English Composition for Secondary School English Teachers, the personnel involved in ISCPET at DePaul also constructed a Scale for Rating Teaching of English Composition (15). This scale consists of a set of "Criteria of Learning" and a set of "Criteria of Teaching" in English composition. The criteria of learning are areas of mastery and skill in English composition, whereas the criteria of teaching are methods and techniques of teaching areas of mastery and skill in English composition which have been proven successful empirically through research in teaching English Composition (8, pp. 966-990). There are ten criteria of learning and thirty criteria of teaching in the scale. The criteria of learning were contributed by the English Institutional Representatives at DePaul; they were all taught in the Special Composition Course. Each criterion of teaching applies to some or to all of the criteria of learning, and the teacher is to be rated on a five-point scale for effectiveness in implementing the method or technique in teaching the concept or skill. If a specific method or technique is not applicable to teaching a specific concept or skill, the space where the rating would be entered is blacked out in the scale.

Essentially, the scale in this form is strongly diagnostic of teaching English composition because of the level of detail to which it carries the ratings. Also, since the scale rates the teaching against a standard of performance, it is an evaluation instrument as well as a measuring instrument in the sense that it permits the comparison of one teacher with other teachers. It is quite probable that the greatest value which can be derived from the scale lies in its use by individual teachers for self-evaluation of their teaching of English composition. The distinction between using the scale for research purposes and using it for supervisory and teaching purposes is explained in the Foreword of the scale. Unfortunately, it was not possible in the course of ISCPET to secure ratings with this scale of a meaningful number of individuals in the sample after they had taught for one year and to analyze such ratings statistically.

V. INTERPRETATION OF CRITERION DATA

This section of the DePaul Special Study report is concerned with the criterion and covariate data, the analysis of covariance, the findings, and the discussion of the study.

The Criterion and Covariate Data

The criterion data consist of the 36 scores of the experimental group and the 36 scores of the control group on the Examination in English Composition for Secondary School English Teachers. The total possible score on the examination was 30 points. But of this total, the scores of both groups ranged from a low score of less than 10 points to a high score of 20 points. Surprisingly enough, each group scored a total of 485 points, which yielded an identical score of 13.47 points as the mean for each set of scores. It is also noteworthy that the mean score for each group is less than half the total possible score. The individual scores of students in each group are listed in Appendix C.

The covariate data consist of the grade point total for the first five English courses of the 36 students in the experimental group and the 36 students in the control group. Transcripts for securing this data were provided by the Registrar's Office of the home institutions. Grade points are on a four-point scale in both universities, hence the total possible grade points was 20. There was a slight difference between the two groups on mean grade point total for the five courses: for the experimental group it was 3.01 and for the control group it was 3.21. Admittedly, standards of grading vary among institutions and among instructors. Nevertheless, it is common practice to consider grade points as sufficiently "standard" to justify educational practices such as college admissions and transfers. Grade points were therefore used to reflect ability to study English, and in this study the control group was thus slightly superior to the experimental group in aptitude for English study.

Analysis of Covariance

Since no guarantee of the equivalence of the experimental and the control group in English study had been secured in the construction of the sample for the DePaul Special Study, there was the possibility that differences in the outcome of the study might be attributable to an initial difference between the groups rather than to the experimental treatment. The occurrence of this faulty inference was eliminated by the choice of the analysis of covariance as the statistical procedure for analyzing the examination scores. This procedure was used because it would adjust the examination scores in terms of the grade point totals, and would thus control the equivalence of the groups. The symbols used to represent the data in the computation of covariance were Y for the examination scores (criterion data) and X for the grade point totals (covariate data). Also, Y,1 was used as the symbol for the examination scores of the experimental group; Y,2 was used as the symbol for the examination scores of the control group; X,1 was used as the symbol for the grade point totals of the experimental group; and X,2 was used as the symbol for grade point totals of the control group. The initial tabular arrangement of the criterion and covariate data for the covariance computations is shown in Appendix C, which was used for the computations involved in analysis of covariance. The table of data shown in Appendix C served as the basis for programming the data for the computer in the Data Processing Center at DePaul University.

The print-out of the analysis of covariance of the scores by the computer is as follows:

Source of Variation	Degree of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Between	1	0.073	0.073	0.01
Within	69	592.132	8.582	
Total	70			

The F-ratio of .01 was far short of being significant. Required was an F of 3.98 for significance at the .05 level.

Findings

The experimental treatment in the DePaul Special Study, the Special Composition Course, did not produce a significant difference between the scores of the two groups, hence the null hypothesis of no significant difference between scores of the groups on preparedness to teach English composition could not be rejected.

Nonetheless, a modest positive result was obtained by the Special Composition Course in that although the experimental group was slightly unequal to the control group in ability to study English, as reflected in grade point totals, they overcame this initial handicap and tied the control group in mean score on the English composition examination.

The variation within both the experimental group and the control group on the examination scores was considerable, as shown by the within-mean-square of 8.582 in the analysis of covariance. This variation above and below the mean in each group, however, followed the same pattern within each group since the between-mean-square in the analysis of covariance was only 0.073.

Discussion

There are good reasons for saying that the DePaul Special Study is significant as a symbol of what can be done with experimental research in preparing English teachers in spite of the fact that its results were not a stand-out in statistical significance. Problem areas for cooperative experimental research in preparing English teachers have been identified, some basic patterns in constructing experimental variables and also measuring instruments have been pioneered, and approaches to establishing a research design have been discovered. The general positive value of the study lies in the fact that it demonstrates that experimental research can be done in preparing English teachers, and it reveals some important things to do as well as some important things not to do.

What may be listed as the most persistent problem encountered in the study is the matter of administrative arrangements. This topic includes class groupings, scheduling of testing, securing ratings of teachers, etc. For research in English Education, as indeed for all experimental research, possibilities for making administrative arrangements must be provided. Strong endorsement of the investigation on the part of the institutional administrations is called for.

A second generalization which may be based on the DePaul Study is that the experimental variable should be given strong experimental design. Possibly, the

Special Composition Course in this study should have departed more radically from the regular composition course. The differences between these courses in content may not have been very markedly great.

A third issue which merits discussion in this study is feasibility to establish the sample. If there had been larger numbers of students preparing to be English teachers available for sampling, the historical hazards for cumulating the groups and for equivalence of the groups could have been considerably lessened.

A fourth remark to be made is that experimental research involving future English teachers was a new experience to the students. They are accustomed to testing for instructional purposes, but they are not accustomed to testing for research purposes. Changes in the outlook of the students on this point were evident during the course of the DePaul Special Study.

A fifth and final point of discussion is that experimental research designs are feasible in English, which is a thoroughly humanistic field. Specifically, the DePaul study evolved patterns of instrument construction, generally using previous research as the source for the elements of which the instruments were to be constructed. Also, approaches to interdisciplinary cooperative research patterns have proven workable.

Keeping in mind the measured outcomes of the DePaul Special Study in the context of the discussion above, it is possible to conclude from the DePaul experience in ISCPET that experimental research has a future in English Education.

Basically, the results of this Special Study were positive. It is recommended, therefore, that English departments implement an additional English composition course for future teachers, emphasizing content and methodology for the high school classroom. Also, the Examination in English Composition for Secondary School English Teachers and the Scale for Rating Teaching of English Composition which were developed in this study need to be refined and standardized.

VI. REFERENCES

1. Diederich, P., The Problem of Grading Essays, Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1957. Mimeographed.

2. Dusel, W. J., "Determining an Efficient Teaching Load in English," Illinois English Bulletin, 1955, 43, No. 1.

3. Educational Testing Service, Sequential Tests of Educational Progress: A Brief, Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1957-1958.

4. Guth, Hans P., English Today and Tomorrow, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

5. Hook, J. N., "Research in the Teaching of Reading and Literature: What College English Departments Can Do," The Allerton Park Conference on Research in the Teaching of English, Champaign, Illinois: The United States Office of Education in Cooperation with the University of Illinois, 1962.

6. _____, "Qualifications of Secondary School Teachers of English: A Preliminary Statement," College English, XXVII (November, 1965), 166-169.

7. Meckel, Henry C., "Research Designs Needed in Studying the Teaching of Language and Literature in the Secondary School," Research Design and the Teaching of English, Champaign, Illinois: The National Council of Teachers of English, 1964.

8. _____, "Research on Teaching Composition and Literature," Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. N. L. Gage, Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1963.

9. Meckel, H. C., J. R. Squire, and V. T. Leonard, Practices in the Teaching of Composition in California Public High Schools, Sacramento, California: California State Department of Education, Bulletin 1958, 27, No. 5.

10. Madaus, George F. and Robert M. Rippey, "Zeroing in on the STEP Writing Test: What Does It Tell a Teacher?" Journal of Educational Measurement, III (Spring, 1966), 19-26.

11. National Council of Teachers of English, An Experience Curriculum in English, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1935.

12. _____, The English Language Arts in the Secondary School, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956.

13. National Council of Teachers of English, Committee on the National Interest, The National Interest and the Teaching of English, Champaign, Illinois: The National Council of Teachers of English, 1961.

14. Neville, M. M. and A. L. Papillon, Examination in English Composition for Secondary School English Teachers, Chicago, Illinois, 1969.

15. _____, Scale for Rating Teaching of English Composition, Chicago: DePaul University in cooperation with the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers, 1968.

16. Searles, J. and G. Carlsen, "English, Language, Grammar, and Composition," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, ed. Chester W. Harris, New York: Macmillan Company, 1960.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Margaret M. Neville and Alfred L. Papillon TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

APPENDIX A

EXAMINATION IN ENGLISH COMPOSITION FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS*

Foreword

Examinations in composition for use in teaching high school English are not numerous. Examinations in composition for use in English teacher preparation and in-service improvement are rare. The present instrument was developed to help fill the need in the latter category.

Rationale

Since this is an examination in English composition for English teachers, it has a dimension which examinations in English composition for students do not have.

Examinations in English composition for students measure knowledge of English composition. Examinations in English composition for teachers must likewise measure knowledge of English composition, but they must furthermore measure competence to teach composition and to evaluate the writing of students. The English teacher must determine whether the English student knows English composition, but beyond that, the English teacher must also evaluate the skill with which the English student applies his knowledge of English composition in writing.

In the present examination, the dual functions stated above for English composition examinations for teachers are achieved by presenting samples of writing by contemporary high school English students, and by directing the examinee to answer questions bearing on the quality of these samples of writing.

To achieve its purpose in depth, the examination is divided into two parts: Questions in Part I are directed toward comparative evaluations of three compositions, and questions in Part II are directed toward evaluations of an individual composition in terms of specific criteria of good writing.

The criteria which constitute the items of both parts of the examination have been evolved in workshops of English teachers and English supervisors. They are therefore the consensus of expert opinions as to what the traits of good writing in the English language are. The options which are presented under the criterion in each item have been selected because they are emphasized in widely-adopted textbooks and handbooks in English composition in America.

The validity of this examination in English composition therefore rests upon the concept that it measures the knowledge and the skills which are evidenced in excellent writing in the English language.

Directions

Below are transcriptions of sample English compositions written by contemporary high school students. The questions in this examination are based upon

---

*(c) Margaret M. Neville, Alfred L. Papillon, 1969.

these compositions. Therefore, you must carefully read Compositions A, B, and C in Part I before you start answering the questions based on them. Likewise, you must carefully read Composition D in Part II before you answer the questions based on it. For many, if not for all of the items, you may wish to refer back to one or to more than one of the compositions before deciding upon an answer. You are free to do so in both parts of the examination.

You are required to record your answers on the answer sheet provided. To enter your answers, block out the letter of the option which best completes the item on the corresponding line of the answer sheet.

PART I. COMPARATIVE EVALUATIONS OF THREE COMPOSITIONS

Directions: Read the following three compositions and answer the questions based on them. When answering an item, compare the compositions on the criterion for that item alone, and forget about all other aspects of the compositions.

COMPOSITION A: The Function of an Artist in Society

An artist is one of the compulsory instruments of human society. Without art a vast amount of people would be lost. They would not have any hobby or anything in which to try and expand their knowledge. People find in the great works of art certain hidden meanings and expressions of life which the ordinary man would just pass up and ignore because of its commercial value.

A huge number of people don't realize it but an artist paints according to the beliefs, feelings or environmnet to which he is exposed. Sometimes as you walk through an art gallery you can trace the most important events of history up to this present day and age. Numerous inconspicuous instruments inserted in a picture may denote a time of triumph, sorrow or desolation.

As pointed out I believe works of art merely reflect a picture of the world itself. There are certain exceptions as there are to anything but this seems to hold stedfast for me.

COMPOSITION B: The Mission of the Artist

An artist is a person who manifests his God-given talents by creating What? Creating art, creating thought impulses through color, sculpture, words or music.

In todays society of modern individuals artists are common but seldom good. A good artist has a certain air about him and his work which is unmistakable. This good artist is the one with which I shall be concerned. A good artist creates thought impulses, thoughts which are pleasent, interesting, inspiring. The mission of the artist is to create good thought impulses, they improve today's society. An artist relies on his inner-self for these thoughts, his conscience. A good artist is therefore also a good person.

COMPOSITION C: The Artist's Mission

Most men serve the human race by providing some necessity or comfort for the body, directly or indirectly. Most industries are concerned with making our living easier.

But outside this majority are some people who make their living, however meagre, by catering to the part of man other than the body. These people, the artists, range from poets and authors, to painters and sculptors, to actors and actresses. These people, like all humans, create. To be happy, humans must be creative. The artist, who is more talented in his field of creativity, uses his talent to help people develop their latent powers of creative thought. The poet does this by using words to plant seeds of thought in our minds. The painter uses images to enliven our creative sense.

By creating, the artist brings to life the better parts of man. This mission of creating is as important as any other vocation of any era. Through the artist man shares God's power to make.

1. Which of the following statements most accurately evaluates comparatively the three compositions on the criterion of quality of the ideas in the compositions?

   a) Composition A is better than both Composition B and Composition C.
   b) Composition B is better than both Composition A and Composition C.
   c) Composition C is better than both Composition A and Composition B.
   d) No one of the three compositions in better than the other two, because all three of them are weak in ideas expressed.
   e) No one of the three compositions is better than the other two, because all three of them are strong in ideas expressed.

2. Which of the following statements most accurately evaluates comparatively the three compositions on the criterion of achieving the purpose envisioned in the compositions?

   a) Composition A is better than both Composition B and Composition C.
   b) Composition B is better than both Composition A and Composition C.
   c) Composition C is better than both Composition A and Composition B.
   d) No one of the three compositions is better than the other two, because all three of them are weak in achieving purpose of the composition.
   e) No one of the three compositions is better than the other two, because all three of them are strong is achieving purpose of the composition.

3. Which of the following statements most accurately evaluates comparatively the three compositions on the criterion of individuality in the language of the compositions?

   a) Composition A is better than both Composition B and Composition C.
   b) Composition B is better than both Composition A and Composition C.
   c) Composition C is better than both Composition A and Composition B.
   d) No one of the three compositions is better than the other two, because all three of them are weak in individuality of language in the composition.
   e) No one of the three compositions is better than the other two, because all three of them are strong in individuality of language in the composition.

4. Which of the following statements most accurately evaluates comparatively the three compositions on the criterion of mechanics and grammar in the compositions?

a) Composition A is better than both Composition B and Composition C.
b) Composition B is better than both Composition A and Composition C.
c) Composition C is better than both Composition A and Composition B.
d) No one of the three compositions is better than the other two, because all three of them are weak in mechanics and grammar.
e) No one of the three compositions is better than the other two, because all three of them are strong in mechanics and grammar.

5. Which of the following statements most accurately evaluates comparatively the three compositions on the criterion of holding the interest of the reader in the compositions?

a) Composition A is better than both Composition B and Composition C.
b) Composition B is better than both Composition A and Composition C.
c) Composition C is better than both Composition A and Composition B.
d) No one of the three compositions is better than the other two, because all three of them are weak in holding the interest of the reader.
e) No one of the three compositions is better than the other two, because all three of them are strong in holding the interest of the reader.

6. Which of the following statements most accurately evaluates comparatively the three compositions on the criterion of generating in the reader an appreciation for good writing?

a) Composition A is better than both Composition B and Composition C.
b) Composition B is better than both Composition A and Composition C.
c) Composition C is better than both Composition A and Composition B.
d) No one of the three compositions is better than the other two, because all three of them are weak in generating appreciation for good writing.
e) No one of the three compositions is better than the other two, because all three of them are strong in generating appreciation for good writing.

7. Which of the following statements most accurately evaluates comparatively the three compositions on the criterion of sentence variation in the compositions?

a) Composition A is better than both Composition B and Composition C.
b) Composition B is better than both Composition A and Composition C.
c) Composition C is better than both Composition A and Composition B.
d) No one of the three compositions is better than the other two, because all three of them are weak in sentence variation.
e) No one of the three compositions is better than the other two, because all three of them are strong in sentence variation.

8. Which of the following statements most accurately evaluates comparatively the three compositions on the criterion of paragraph development in the compositions?

a) Composition A is better than both Composition B and Composition C.
b) Composition B is better than both Composition A and Composition C.
c) Composition C is better than both Composition A and Composition B.
d) No one of the three compositions is better than the other two, because all three of them are weak in paragraph development.
e) No one of the three compositions is better than the other two, because all three of them are strong in paragraph development.

9. Which of the following statements most accurately evaluates comparatively the three compositions on the criterion of sequence of the sentences and paragraphs in the compositions?

a) Composition A is better than both Composition B and Composition C.
b) Composition B is better than both Composition A and Composition C.
c) Composition C is better than both Composition A and Composition B.
d) No one of the three compositions is better than the other two, because all three of them are weak in sequence of the sentences and paragraphs.
e) No one of the three compositions is better than the other two, because all three of them are strong in sequence of the sentences and paragraphs.

10. Which of the following statements most accurately evaluates comparatively the three compositions on the criterion of phrasing ideas clearly in the compositions?

a) Composition A is better than both Composition B and Composition C.
b) Composition B is better than both Composition A and Composition C.
c) Composition C is better than both Composition A and Composition B.
d) No one of the three compositions is better than the other bwo, because all three of them are weak in phrasing ideas clearly.
e) No one of the three compositions is better than the other two, because all three of them are strong in phrasing ideas clearly.

PART II. EVALUATION OF A COMPOSITION IN TERMS OF SPECIFIC CRITERIA

Directions: Read the following composition and answer the questions based on it. When answering an item, evaluate the composition on the criterion in that item alone, and forget about all other aspects of the composition.

COMPOSITION D: The Disallusionment of Teenagers

In my casual observation of teenagers boy-girl relationships, I have discovered (or rediscovered) the fact that neither the boy nor the girl know what they are doing. Boys and girls become infatuated with each other, mistake it for love, and sometimes get in trouble. This infatuation usually leads to going steady which invariably leads to the stunting of the couples character development.

I have observed two basic underlying causes for the problem of going steady. First, no adolescent of sixteen or seventeen has any idea of what love is. Lacking the experience of college and of socializing with a variety of people, the adolescent is not capable of loving because he knows not what love is. The feeling a boy experiences when he likes a girl is caused by his being in love with love. He has a concept of what love, then he falls in love with this concept. The second reason is that a boy of sixteen has a concept of what kind of girl he wants to marry. He has a mental picture of the characteristics he wants in a marital partner. When, in his dealings with girls, he runs across a girl who closely parallels his mental image, he is immediately attracted to her. He may even become confused between the feeling of infatuation and the feeling of being in love with love. Thus our unsuspecting naive teenager thinks he is in love with the girl and they start going steady.

Going steady is the first step to a devistating downfall. The steady couple become extremely familiar with each other and become lax about what they say and do. This phenomenon causes the personality growth of the couple to come to a screeching halt. I personally know of many people who have gone steady for a year or two and now do not know how to act in a mixed group.

Besides destroying character development, going steady produces doubt in the minds of both the boy and the girl. When they are ready for marriage, they will wonder whether or not they would have found a better mate during the time they were going steady.

There is one consolation though. This false love is curable. The greatest aid to arresting it is time. In time the couple will realize their mistake and promptly break all existing promises and pacts that ever existed between them. Another cure for it is an education on why they think they are in love and why they should not go steady.

Going steady instills on the couple a false sense of security. Both the boy and the girl know where their next date is coming from. Even though it sounds wonderful, going steady is tragic and it is my personal opinion that all avalaible means should be used to arrest it.

11. Examining the paragraphs in this composition rhetorically, would you say:

a) The sentences generally are too complicated for the material involved.
b) The sentences generally are too simple for the material involve.
c) The sentences generally are suitably constructed for the material involved.
d) A few of the sentences are too complicated for the material involved.
e) A few of the sentences are too simple for the material involved.

12. Which of the following statements most correctly evaluates the use of punctuation in this composition?

a) There are outright errors in punctuation in the composition.
b) In one or two instances, the use of punctuation obscures the meaning.
c) The use of punctuation generally could make the meaning clearer.
d) The use of punctuation consistently makes the meaning clear.
e) The use of punctuation adroitly refines the meaning in the composition.

13. Of this composition, it may be said regarding errors in sentence sense, that:

a) There are run-on sentences but no incomplete sentences in the composition.
b) There are incomplete sentences but no run-on sentences in the composition.
c) There is no sentence error of any type in the composition.
d) There are both run-on and incomplete sentences in the composition.
e) The writer shows advanced skills in making correct sentences.

14. Of this composition, it may be said regarding the agreement of subjects and verbs in sentences that:

a) There are unnecessary shifts in voice and subject.
b) The past is confused with the past participle.
c) Dialectal or substandard forms of verbs are used.

d) There is needless shifting from one tense to another.
e) Usage in the agreement of subjects and verbs is colloquial rather than standard.

15. Of this composition, it may be said regarding pronoun references that:

a) There are errors in using pronouns as part of a compound.
b) Possessive pronouns are confused with contractions sounding like them.
c) References to antecedents are not clear.
d) Indefinite pronouns you, it, they are used carelessly.
e) Person of pronouns is shifted needlessly.

16. Of this composition, it may be said concerning the writer's use of words, that:

a) Colloquialisms are over-used in the composition.
b) There are unjustified substandard usages of words in this composition.
c) This composition rates above average in euphony in use of words.
d) A few words in this composition have wrong denotations.
e) Some words used in this composition are trite.

17. Of this composition, it may be said concerning the writer's expressing ideas effectively in sentences that:

a) Statements of equal importance are properly joined.
b) Statements of lesser importance are properly subordinated.
c) Reference words are clearly established.
d) Constructions are not awkward or illogical.
e) Constructions are not inconsistent.

18. Sentences in this composition are made forceful and interesting by:

a) The use of strong nouns and verbs.
b) The use of vivid adjectives and adverbs.
c) Vigor at beginning of sentences.
d) Use of active voice.
e) Use of suspense in periodic sentences.

19. Concerning the sense of purpose in writing, it may be said of this composition that:

a) The composition has purpose, but it is set forth too late.
b) There is lack of clear purpose in the composition.
c) Purpose is maintained consistently throughout the composition.
d) Purpose is dependent on a few key words throughout the composition.
e) A few sentences in the composition are unrelated to the purpose.

20. Concerning the sense of audience of this composition, it may be said that the writer:

a) Did not have definite audience in mind.
b) Did not keep the same audience in mind consistently.
c) Did not suit vocabulary and language to the audience.
d) Addressed a fanciful audience, not a realistic one.
e) Addressed a real audience realistically.

21. Concerning the length of sentences in this composition, which of the following critical statements is most applicable?

a) The sentences are generally too long.
b) The sentences are generally too short.
c) Some sentences should be three times as long as some others.
d) No sentences should be much longer than any others.
e) Considerations of sentence length do not apply to this composition topic.

22. From the viewpoint of variety in sentences according to their structure, which of the following statements is most applicable to this composition?

a) A greater number of the sentences should be simple sentences.
b) A greater number of the sentences should be compound sentences.
c) A greater number of the sentences should be compound-complex sentences.
d) A greater number of the sentences should be complex sentences.
e) Most of the sentences in this composition are complex sentences and this is as it should be.

23. Which of the following statements best describes the compound sentences in this composition?

a) The ideas combined are not closely related.
b) The ideas combined are not equally important.
c) The conjuctions do not express the proper relationship between clauses.
d) They are really only simple sentences with compound subjects and/or predicates.
e) They are correctly compounded.

24. Which of the following statements best describes the complex sentences in this composition?

a) The main idea is not in the independent clause.
b) The nonrestrictive clauses are not set off by commas.
c) The restrictive clauses are set off by commas.
d) The conjunctions introducing subordinate clauses do not show correct relationships.
e) Ideas are properly subordinated in the complex sentences.

25. Which of the following statements best evaluates the development of topical sentences in the paragraphs in this composition?

a) There is too much variety in the methods of developing paragraphs.
b) There is too little variety in the methods of developing paragraphs.
c) The writer does not have good command of the methods of developing paragraphs.
d) The writer does not suit the method of developing a paragraph to its topic.
e) The writer shows real skill in aspects of developing paragraphs.

26. Of the following phrases, which most accurately states the general effect of this composition as a unified whole?

a) Very well unified
b) Well unified
c) Fairly well unified
d) Not well unified
e) Not unified

27. From the viewpoint of linguistics, which of the following statements most accurately evaluates the usage of language in this composition?

a) It reflects American regional peculiarities in language usage.
b) It reflects social class peculiarities in language usage.
c) It follows conventions familiar to educated users of the English language.
d) It reflects peculiarities in language usage based on time.
e) It reflects peculiarities in English language usage by foreigners.

28. Which of the following statements is the most meaningful critical evaluation of the topic sentence and the concluding sentence in this composition?

a) These sentences are easy to identify.
b) These sentences are not appropriately placed.
c) These sentences are appropriately placed.
d) These sentences have an appropriate impact on the reader.
e) These sentences greatly advance the purpose of the composition.

29. How would you categorize the spelling errors, if any, in this composition?

a) Misspelling seems caused by mispronunciation.
b) Misspelling occurs in new and unusual words.
c) Misspelling occurs in so-called "common words frequently misspelled."
d) Misspelling seems caused by poor spelling habits.
e) No misspelling in this composition.

30. Does the writer of this composition achieve any suggestion of pictures or feelings through any of the following approaches to style?

a) Use of formal figures of speech.
b) Use of common words which denote pictures and feelings.
c) Selection of words for their sound as well as their meanings.
d) Arrangement of words to produce special effects.
e) No approach to style in the composition.

APPENDIX B

KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL IN WRITTEN COMPOSITION
(Section of Preliminary Statement of Qualifications
of Secondary School Teachers of English)

Minimal	Good	Superior
Ability to recognize such characteristics of good writing as substantial and relevant content; organization; clarity; appropriateness of tone; and accuracy in mechanics and usage.	A well-developed ability to recognize such characteristics of good writing as substantial and relevant content; organization; clarity; appropriateness of tone; and accuracy in mechanics and usage.	In addition to "good" competencies, a detailed knowledge of theories and history of rhetoric and of the development of English prose.
A basic understaning of the processes of composing.	Perception of the complexities in the processes of composing.	Perception of the subtleties, as well as the complexities, in the processes of composing.
Ability to analyze and to communicate to students the specific strengths and weaknesses in their writing.	Ability to analyze in detail the strengths and weaknesses in the writing of students and to communicate the analysis effectively.	Ability to give highly perceptive analysis of the strengths and weaknesses in the writing of students, to communicate this exactly, and to motivate students toward greater and greater strengths.
Ability to produce writing with at least a modicum of the characteristics noted above.	Proficiency in producing writing with at least considerable strength in the characteristics noted above.	Proficiency in producing writing of genuine power; ability and willingness to write for publication.

APPENDIX C

Scores of the Experimental and the Control Groups on Criterion (Examination) and Covariate (Grade Points) Variables

SPECIAL COMPOSITION COURSE

STUDENT	COMP. SCORE (Y, 1) N=36	TOTAL GRADE POINTS
1.	15	17
2.	10	14
3.	10	14
4.	11	17
5.	17	19
6.	12	13
7.	13	15
8.	12	14
9.	14	14
10.	10	12
11.	13	10
12.	15	19
13.	14	17
14.	15	10
15.	14	20
16.	16	14
17.	9	16
18.	12	11
19.	14	13
20.	13	11
21.	16	13
22.	12	15
23.	13	19
24.	14	16
25.	9	14
26.	12	15
27.	17	13
28.	16	14
29.	12	17
30.	17	17
31.	12	13
32.	16	15
33.	13	20
34.	14	19
35.	12	15
36.	16	16

REGULAR COMPOSITION COURSE

STUDENT	COMP. SCORE (Y, 2) N=36	TOTAL GRADE POINTS
1.	18	20
2.	12	19
3.	12	18
4.	12	13
5.	14	12
6.	13	17
7.	15	18
8.	13	20
9.	17	16
10.	12	12
11.	14	12
12.	12	17
13.	12	14
14.	8	15
15.	10	13
16.	13	17
17.	13	15
18.	13	17
19.	13	20
20.	13	16
21.	17	19
22.	17	16
23.	18	20
24.	18	16
25.	16	15
26.	19	15
27.	20	12
28.	12	17
29.	15	14
30.	13	16
31.	7	15
32.	14	17
33.	9	18
34.	5	16
35.	16	15
36.	10	16